

## REMARKS

Applicant acknowledges the allowance of Claims 18-27. Applicant further acknowledges that the drawings filed on January 11, 2002 are acceptable.

Claims 28-33 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Harness et al. (Spurious Mode Suppression in Electrostatic Comb Drive XY Microactuators).

Claim 28 is patentable over the Harness et al. device by calling for a micromechanical device of the type set forth therein in which, among other things, the movable member and the first microactuator are balanced in the first direction for substantially eliminating undesirable movement of the movable member in the first direction in response to externally applied accelerations to the device and the movable member and the second microactuator are balanced in the second direction for substantially eliminating undesirable movement of the movable member in the second direction in response to externally applied accelerations to the device.

Harness et al. does not suggest or disclose, nor is it inherent therein, that the suspensions in each of the designs A and B of Figure 1 of Harness et al. substantially eliminate undesirable movement of the table therein in response to externally applied accelerations. In fact, Harness et al. teach away from the suspensions therein substantially eliminating movement because to do so would preclude movement of by the actuators disclosed therein and thus preclude movement of the table. The suspensions in the Harness et al. microactuators are required to permit the operation of such microactuators. As can thus be seen, the rejection of Claim 28 as being anticipated by Harness et al. is in error and should be withdrawn.

Claims 29-31 depend from Claim 28 and are patentable for the same reasons as Claim 28 and by reason of the additional limitations called for therein. Claims 29 and 31 have been amended to correct the dependency called for therein.

Claim 32 is patentable by calling for a micromechanical device of the type set forth therein having, among other things, balancing means carried by the substrate and coupled to the actuator means for substantially eliminating motion of the movable member in response to externally applied accelerations in first and second directions substantially perpendicular to each other. There is no suggestion or disclosure in Harness et al. of a balancing means, let alone a balancing means for substantially eliminating motion as called for in Claim 32. Accordingly, the rejection of Claim 32 as being anticipated by Harness et al. is in error and should be withdrawn.

Claim 33 depends from Claim 32 and is patentable for the same reasons as Claim 32 and by reason of the additional limitation called for therein.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the claims of record are allowable and that the application should be passed to issue. Should the Examiner believe that the application is not in a condition for allowance and that a telephone interview would help further prosecution of this case, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the phone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'E. N. Bachand', written over the printed name.

Edward N. Bachand  
Reg. No. 37,085

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP  
Suite 3400, Four Embarcadero Center  
San Francisco, CA 94111-4187  
Telephone: (650) 494-8700  
1072999